

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, as amended, in view of the following remarks.

The present invention as set forth in **amended Claim 11** relates to a dewaxing additive, comprising:

(i) in polymerized form, the free-radically polymerizable monomers of Formulae A and B; and (ii) customary dewaxing additive.

Schauber and Neunier fail to disclose or suggest a dewaxing additive which combines monomers of formulae A and B with customary dewaxing additives and that is suitable for solvent deparaffinization of paraffinic mineral oil distillates and which influence the size and shape of paraffin crystals obtained from the paraffinic mineral oil (see also new Claim 30).

Schauber discloses viscosity index improving copolymers (see the abstract) and not a mixture of dewaxing additives as claimed in Claim 11. Thus, Claim 11 is not anticipated. Further, Schauber has no interest in providing a dewaxing additive that is suitable for solvent deparaffinization of paraffinic mineral oil distillates and which influences the size and shape of paraffin crystals obtained from the paraffinic mineral oil (see also new Claim 30). Thus, Claim 11 is not obvious.

Neunier discloses polymeric additives that inhibit the crystallization of paraffin and improve the flow of crude oils and compositions containing such crude oils (see the abstract). Neunier thus has no interest in providing a mixture of dewaxing additives as claimed in Claim 11. Thus, Claim 11 is not anticipated. Further, Neunier has no interest in providing a dewaxing additive that is suitable for solvent deparaffinization of paraffinic mineral oil distillates and which influences the size and shape of paraffin crystals obtained from the paraffinic mineral oil (see also new Claim 30). Thus, Claim 11 is not obvious.

Notably, Claim 11 was not rejected over Esso Co. and Liesen et al.

Amended Claim 14 relates to a method for solvent deparaffinization of paraffinic mineral oil distillates, comprising:

adding a dewaxing additive to said paraffinic mineral oil distillates, **to obtain paraffin crystals; and**

separating said paraffin crystals;

wherein said dewaxing additive comprises in polymerized form the following free-radically polymerizable monomers of Formulae A and B.

Schauber and Neunier fail to disclose or suggest a method as claimed in which paraffinic mineral oil distillates are deparaffinized by adding a dewaxing additive to said paraffinic mineral oil distillates, **to obtain paraffin crystals; and separating said paraffin crystals.**

Schauber discloses viscosity index improving copolymers (see the abstract) and not a method as claimed in which paraffinic mineral oil distillates are deparaffinized by adding a dewaxing additive to said paraffinic mineral oil distillates, **to obtain paraffin crystals; and separating said paraffin crystals** as claimed in Claim 14.

Neunier discloses polymeric additives that **inhibit the crystallization of paraffin** and improve the flow of crude oils and compositions containing such crude oils (see the abstract, col. 10, lines 7-10) and not a method as claimed in which paraffinic mineral oil distillates are deparaffinized by adding a dewaxing additive to said paraffinic mineral oil distillates, **to obtain paraffin crystals; and separating said paraffin crystals** as claimed in Claim 14.

Notably, Claim 14 was not rejected over Esso Co. and Liesen et al.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Schauber, the rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Neunier, the rejection of Claims 1-8, 10, 15 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Esso Co. and the rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Liesen et al

Application No.: 10/505,370

Reply to Office Action of: October 10, 2006


are believed to be unsustainable as the present invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

This application presents allowable subject matter, and the Examiner is kindly requested to pass it to issue. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the claims or otherwise wish to discuss this case, he is kindly invited to contact Applicants' below-signed representative, who would be happy to provide any assistance deemed necessary in speeding this application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number
22850


Kirsten A. Grueneberg, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 47,297